UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|----------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/762,106 | 01/21/2004 | Knud Reuter | CH-7961/LeA 35,552 | 3885 |
| | 7590 02/02/200 OVE LODGE & HUT | EXAMINER | | |
| PO BOX 2207 | | WU, SHEAN CHIU | | |
| WILMINGTON, DE 19899 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 1795 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 02/02/2009 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|-----------------|---------------|--|
| 10/762,106 | REUTER ET AL. | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |
| LAAIIIIIEI | Art Unit | |

| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the | ne cover sheet with the correspondence address | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| THE REPLY FILED <u>26 January 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICA | TION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. | | | |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with a for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114 periods: | 1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request | | | |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the | e final rejection. | | | |
| no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than S Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY | tion, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO | | | |
| MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension an under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | d the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as | | | |
| The Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>26 January 2009</u>. A brief in com the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any ex | tension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the | | | |
| appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be AMENDMENTS | med within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). | | | |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the proposed amendment (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for the properties of the properti | n and/or search (see NOTE below); | | | |
| appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a correspor NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). | | | | |
| 4. $oxed{oxed}$ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See a | ttached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324). | | | |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | | | |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if non-allowable claim(s). | | | | |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: 49 and 50. Claim(s) objected to: 62 and 63. Claim(s) rejected: 46-48,51-61 and 64-68. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | , <u> </u> | | | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before of because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficier was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | | |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was | <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a | | | |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the s REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | tatus of the claims after entry is below or attached. | | | |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does No See Continuation Sheet. | OT place the application in condition for allowance because: | | | |
| 12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). | | | | |
| 13. Other: | | | | |
| | Shean C Wu/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1795 | | | |
| | | | | |

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

In claims 46 and 66-67, the "3,4-alkylenedioxythiophens" should be "3,4-alkylenedioxythiophen".

Claim 52 is vague because the 3,-4-alkylenedioxythiophene is "a" compound in claim 46 not a mixture. Also, the Formula 1 should be Formula (I).

Claim 54 is vague because the claimed polythiophene (polymer) comprising recurring units is a product by the process claim (claim 51) and the process claim (claim 51) is a method of making a polythiophene by polymerizing the compound of claim 46. It is no clear what are the recurring units in claim 46 and there are no recurring units in claim 46. If applicants intend to claim a polythiophene, they should claim a polythiophene by polymerizing the compound of claim 46. Therefore, claims 55-58 and 62-64 also have the problems because they are dependent claims.

Claim 60 is vague because the process claim is depended on the product (claim 54), which is further depended on another process claim (51), which is also further is depended on the product (claim 46).

Overall, it will be more clear by separately claiming an article, a compound, a mixture, a polymer and the methods of preparing thereof.